Amendments to the Drawings

FIG. 2 has been amended to add the reference number 60. FIG. 2 has also been amended to correct the part numbers for "screen capture component" from "64a" to "60a", "change detector component" from "64b" to "60b", "image compression component" from "64c" to "60c", and "data transport component" from "64d" to "60d". A Replacement Sheet is attached for the amended FIG. 2.

REMARKS

Claims 10 – 14 and 18 – 22 have been withdrawn. Claim 15 has been amended. Claims 1 – 9 and 15 - 17 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.85(p)(5) because the reference sign for "software component 60" was missing. Drawing sheet 2 has been amended to add the reference number 60. The drawings were further objected to because part numbers 60a, 60b, 60c, and 60d were mislabeled. Drawing sheet 2 has been amended to correct these part numbers. A replacement sheet is attached.

Claim Objections

Claims 15 – 17 were objected to because of an informality. Claim 15 has been amended to recite "software component" rather than "system component" in order to correct the informality.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 7 – 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action cites the claimed "administrator preference limits…" as "vague and unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 sets forth the step of "determining a preference for the shared application". Claim 6 states that the preference may be an administrator preference. Claim 7 then states that the administrator preference can limit the selection of a user preference (claim 3) according to a maximum data rate. Thus the method/process applicant intends to encompass in claim 7 is the selection of a user preference.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 5, 9, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Popa (US Patent no. 6,006,231). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Applicants claimed method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system, one of the computers has a plurality of system components, one of the system components adapted to provide feedback to the shared application, the method comprising the steps of determining a preference for the shared application; monitoring a feedback from the one of the system components; and configuring one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback.

In contrast, Popa fails to teach or suggest a method including the claimed steps of "monitoring a feedback from the one of the system components; and configuring one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback".

In support of the claimed "monitoring a feedback…" the Office Action refers to Popa, col. 5, lines 50-55, and col. 6, lines 7-20, "noted that the server application monitors the request message from the client, and the preference of the image size and resolution picked by the user". (Office Action paragraph 11.) However, monitoring an external request from a user cannot be construed as monitoring feedback from a system component in a computer.

In support of the claimed "configuring one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback" the Office action refers to Popa col. 6, lines 14-30, noting that based on the user's choice, the server configures its settings. Again, the configuration of Popa is based directly on the user's choice. There is no teaching or suggestion that any feedback from a component in the server or server application is involved.

Since Popa fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed steps of "monitoring a feedback from the one of the system components" and "configuring one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback", the Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 – 5 and 9 are allowable over Popa. Independent Claim 15 contains limitations similar to those of Claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15 and 16 are allowable over Popa.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 – 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popa in view of Boston et al. (Publication no. US 2004/0101272A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 – 8 depend on Claim 1. Claim 17 depends on Claim 15. Popa fails to teach or suggest the claimed feedback requirements of Claims 1 and 15. Boston adds nothing further to solve the deficiencies of Popa. Thus Popa and Boston, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the applicant's claimed invention as set forth in claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 28, 2007
Reg. No.: 36,947

/Mary M. Steubing/
Mary M. Steubing
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003